UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELBERT HARRIS, III,	
Plaintiff(s),	CASE NO. CV 08- 2353 PJH
v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ET AL.,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS
Defendant(s).	
Counsel report that they have met as following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R.	nd conferred regarding ADR and have reached the 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:
The parties agree to participate in the follow	ving ADR process:
Court Processes: Non-binding Arbitration (AI ✓ Early Neutral Evaluation (EI ✓ Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)	,
appreciably more likely to meet their needs	tlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is than any other form of ADR, must participate in an is form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for tle 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)
Private Process: Private ADR (please identify	process and provider)
The parties agree to hold the ADR session to the presumptive deadline (The referring the case to an ADR) other requested deadline	by: he deadline is 90 days from the date of the order A process unless otherwise ordered.)
Dated: July 18, 2008	Curtis G. Oler Attorney for Plaintiff
Dated: July 18, 2008	DCA Adelmise R. Warner Attorney for Defendant

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Pursuant to the Stipulation above, the captioned matter is hereby referred to:

Non-binding Arbitration

Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE)

XMediation

Private ADR

Deadline for ADR session

X90 days from the date of this order.

other

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:	7/29/08	
--------	---------	--

